1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

426
431

almost entirely between members of the same clan or members of linked clans or else between individuals connected by marriage. It is not to be supposed that we have here a case of real communism in chattels. Part of it was nothing more than borrowing, and another part a borrowing of a different kind in which equivalent values were exchanged instead of identical objects. From my own experience with Indians I think it is safe to assume that every family was pretty acutely conscious of its credit or debit as regards every other family, and that a persistent "sponge" was looked down upon and avoided. That there were such "sponges" we know from Stiggins, who says:

7360
574

"If it (hospitality) is beneficial in keeping the traveler and stranger from hunger and starvation, it keeps a great many of their town people of men and women sauntering from door to door in loafing idleness; if no one will cloathe them, they are perfectly satisfied for every house will feed them."[4]

421

Adair gives an amusing account of the skill with which one Indian parried the appeal of another for a certain service.[5] The sense of individual ownership was by no means wanting; only for the reasons above given it did not always appear so keenly developed as with us. Social usage had sanctioned a method of exchange comparatively unknown to Europeans and had given a definite "set" to the instinct of private ownership, not abolished it. Indeed, elsewhere Bartram himself says:

"All that a man earns by his labor or industry belongs to himself; he has the use and disposal of it according to the custom and usages of the people. He may clear, settle, and plant as much land as he pleases, and wherever he will within the boundaries of his tribe."[6]

426

Debts, which probably had nothing to do with this social exchange, were also recognized. Adair remarks that "when they are able, without greater damage to themselves, than benefit to their creditor, they discharge their honest debts." And he adds that when differences arose over such matters they were settled by "the head Archimagus, and his old beloved men," and that a creditor could seize property of the debtor to the amount due him.[7] Both Creeks and Seminole formerly had a high reputation among the white people for punctuality in the payment of their debts.[8] In this particular civilization has not worked for their betterment. Writing in the middle of the nineteenth century Eakins says of them: "Obligations, in regard to debt, are considered binding. Time does not diminish these obligations among the Creeks. The Indian does not consider ill-luck in hunting, as exonerating him from paying his debts."[9]

---

[4] Stiggins, MS.
[5] Adair, Hist. Am. Inds., pp. 404-405.
[6] Bartram in Trans. Am. Eth. Soc., vol. III, p. 37.
[7] Adair, op. cit., p. 429.
[8] Schoolcraft, Ind. Tribes, vol. I, p. 278.
[9] Ibid., p. 283.

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

589 Elsewhere the same observer informs us that, in 1840, the Creek national council undertook to reduce the period of enforced widowhood to 12 months, but so much opposition was aroused that they were forced to restore the old law the next year.[37]

• [736] The Tukabahchee chief informed Hitchcock that when there were widows or orphans with no one to take care of them he called the people out and had them put up a house for them, fence in a garden, and plant corn.

Claiborne says:

"With the Creeks, when a man dies, his wives can not dress up, or go into company, or attend the dances or appear in the town square, or bind up their hair for the period of 12 months, during which time they must remain chaste under the penalty of beating and cropping as above stated. The relations of the deceased husband have the privilege of releasing them from the observance of this custom before the year is out, but they seldom do so."[38]

[587 614] The fact comes out plainly in all of these accounts that the clan, or rather the family group within the clan, which has furnished the husband or the wife of the widow or widower feels itself under obligations to supply his or her place, and on the other hand that it has the prior right to supply it. That not merely the man but the group had acquired the right to the individual is shown clearly by Swan's statement above that a widow who made free with any man until after four summers was considered an adulteress. This does not mean a communal right, however; merely a right to furnish the bereaved party with another spouse.

As might have been anticipated, Adair has a great deal to say on this subject, though it must be understood that his remarks apply more particularly to the Chickasaw:

"All the Indian widows, by an established strict penal law, mourn for the loss of their deceased husbands; and among some tribes for the space of three or four years. . . .

"The Muskohge widows are obliged to live a chaste single life, for the tedious space of four years; and the Chikkasah women, for the term of three, at the risque of the law of adultery being executed against the recusants. Every evening, and at the very dawn of day, for the first year of her widowhood, she is obliged through the fear of shame to lament her loss, in very intense audible strains. . . .

"Their law compels the widow, through the long term of her weeds, to refrain all public company and diversions, at the penalty of an adulteress; and likewise to go with flowing hair, without the privilege of oil to anoint it. The nearest kinsmen of the deceased husband, keep a very watchful eye over her conduct, in this respect. The

[37] See p. 334.
[38] Claiborne, Miss., vol. i, p. 488.